

- prostor mladinske književnosti »danes«;
- delo zelo jasno dokazuje, kako v sodobnem mladinskem pripovedništvu sobivajo in se dopolnjujejo različne, tudi nasprotujoče si »pisave«, ki izvirajo iz različnega pojmovanja podobe sodobnega otroka ali mladostnika ter funkcije mladinskega literarnega dela;
 - posebna vrednost monografije je tako njena informativnost (natančne bibliografije del, navajanje nagrad in dejavnosti avtorjev, izčrpnost virov) ter poglobljena interpretacijska zmožnost, ki predstavlja temeljne značilnosti avtorjevega opusa *kot celote*.

Igor Saksida

Univerza v Ljubljani
igor.saksida@guest.arnes.si

JANUSZ BAŃCZEROWSKI:
A VILÁG NYELVI KÉPE. A VILÁGKÉP MINT A VALÓSÁG METAKÉPE A NYELVBEN ÉS A NYELVHASZNÁLATBAN.
Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.
Segédkönyvek a nyelvészet tanulmányozásához 86, 2008, 355 pp.

The book under review, which appeared in the series of Language Study as volume 86, contains a number of articles devoted to various aspects of research in cognitive linguistics, linguistic semantics and human communication. The volume contains a preface, three chapters and an index of names. Each contribution in the chapters is provided with a list of bibliographical references,

but there is no collective bibliography at the end of the book, which would be extremely valuable.

Chapter one is entitled “Language as the subject of linguistics and its role in creating the image of the world in our mind” (pp. 17–151). The contributions in this introductory chapter cover a wide range of problems beginning with the nature of human language and its usage through the methodological status of modern linguistics, communications fragments, profilization and linguistic categorization to the scientific and cultural image of the world in language as components of an alternate reality. All of the articles in the chapter deal with human language and its various aspects in general. Their purpose is to prepare the conceptual ground. They are based on the belief that it is an advantage to have a broad map of the terrain sketched out before one considers its more specific features on a smaller scale, a general context in reference to which the detail makes sense. It is sometimes the case that people are introduced to detail without it being made clear what it is a detail of. Clearly, a general understanding of ideas is not sufficient; there needs to be closer scrutiny. But equally, close scrutiny can be myopic and meaningless unless it is related to the larger view. Indeed, it can be said that precondition for more particular enquiry is an awareness of what, in general, the particulars are about. The articles in the first chapter (especially the first seven, pp. 17–93) provide this large-scale view of different areas of language study. They reflect Bańczerowski’s conviction that “there cannot exist any real knowledge or (human) capability separated from people themselves” (p. 17). It is generally held that one can look at language as a sociological phenomenon or else

apprehend it as a mere corpus of text, and finally as a means of verbal communication. The author also poses the question: What is language and what is its main function? The answer seems to be clear and generally agreed: language is the most frequently used and most highly developed means of human communication we possess. Bańcerowski, however, refuses to accept this conventional definition. In his opinion, language is rather a kind of coding mechanism that cannot be identified with utterances which are the results of its functioning. According to him, the relation of the language to the utterance is like the relation of the manufacturing program to the product. He says that “the concept of language as a means of communication is entirely unacceptable. The concept of man necessarily implies the concept of language. Man is a creature that is by his nature “determined by language. Language is not an accessory of man but it is his constituent part, the relevant element of his cognitive program” (p. 23). Bańcerowski points out that language has not only an interpersonal role making possible the communication between people, but also an intrapersonal one. One of the most important elements of the latter role is the cognitive function. This function, says the author, “assures the cognition, categorization, conceptualization and cumulation of the knowledge acquired from the outer world. The cognitive function assures furthermore the reproduction of knowledge gained by others or the shaping of views, beliefs and confessions that concern the man’s inner world” (p. 23). The author adds furthermore that language is not used only for communication but sometimes also for other purposes. Without going into all the depressing details, suffice it

to say that language is often a means of disinformation, deceit, black propaganda and manipulation. And, although it is true that language is the most important method we have of communicating, it is manifestly not the only method (Bear in mind that we can communicate by gestures, facial expressions, or touch, for instance, and these are not language).

The next section presents a look at the basic lines of approach to language and gives an exposition of the problems of human memory and linguistic functions from the usage point of view. The author thinks that language can be considered as a set of ready-made objects existing in human memory, as a kind of material that can be used in everyday situations at any time. In other words, language exists in our memory in the form of lexical units and set phrases we can recall if necessary. Bańcerowski, by making use of the definition of language outlined above, rules out, or, rather, refutes the concept of language as a vast network of structures and systems based on the dichotomy syntagmatic vs paradigmatic which we were taught in school, and which underlies many linguistic approaches to language today. Although this concept has been taken as the keynote of a number of theories of language, a closer look at usage does not definitively prove that language consists of phonemes, morphemes, syllables and lexemes as basic units. On the contrary, it seems to be much more possible that language consists of basic elements which are called “information fragments” (IF) or “communications fragments” (CF). These can be identified with the above-mentioned objects existing in our memory and one does not need to know any grammatical rules to use them as they are “prefabricated parts”. This can be a satisfactory expla-

nation of the fact that one can speak a language fairly well without knowing any grammar (like most average native speakers).

The difference between the first chapter and the second consists in one basic feature. The articles included in the first chapter concentrate basically on general problems of human language and its usage, while the second chapter is characterized by contributions of a more specific nature. The second chapter entitled “The linguistic image of the world” (pp. 155–281) contains, among other things, a description of the image of several concepts and things in language such as *father, mother, family, head, hand, earth, home country* and *death*. The essays in this chapter are based on the theoretical principle that the linguistic image of the world is not an accurate mapping of reality, but merely a version of it, reflecting a human way of looking at things. Therefore, it is necessarily anthropocentric. The linguistic image of the world is, of course, not identical with the scientific world view, as it reflects the superficial knowledge of an average language user (Remember that even if most people know that the earth is a planet that travels around the sun, human languages still reflect a geocentric view of the universe cf. “the sun *rises* in the East and *sets* in the West, *sunrise, sunup, sunset, sundown*”). According to Bańcerowski, the structure of the inner mental reality of human memory is not linear but hierarchical, and metaphors play a decisive role in understanding of the linguistic image of the world as well as that of the functioning of collocations.

One could say that metaphors are the most essential things for language to function, as has been pointed out by the

outstanding cognitivist, George Lakoff. In his book entitled *The Current State of Research on Metaphor and Cognitive Topology*, Lakoff speaks about “conceptual” and “image metaphors”. The first one is based on mapping of one domain onto another, while the second is based on the confrontation of two images. Image metaphors cause special difficulties in translation as they only exist in a given culture, which is determined by social, historical and environmental factors. Bańcerowski deals with the problem of untranslatability of metaphors in some detail and comes to the conclusion that language and culture are inseparable, which should also be reflected in translating. Directly related is the question of the many levels of equivalence which is also touched on by the author (p 110). Another important item of information concerning metaphors is that we often refer to or describe ourselves as a “container” that is separated from the rest of the world, and that has an outer and an inner side (cf. *sy is open, to be open with sy, to feel sg inside*). Work also is often referred to as a substance (cf. *a lot of work, be out of work, give sy work, look for work*).

The most important of the five senses of the body is sight. There is ample evidence that this is the sense by which we receive most knowledge of things in the world around us. That is why our human culture can justly be called a “visual culture”. Since light is essential for seeing, it is only understandable that the dichotomy light vs darkness plays a principal role in the metaphorical structure of human languages. The adjectives bright vs dark, besides their descriptive function, have an axiological function as well; bright is usually associated with positive, dark with negative meanings.

Chapter three is entitled “Metainformational (metatextual) operators” (pp. 285–349) and includes the following studies: “Metainformational pointers to meaning in text” (pp. 285–288), “Conjunctions as metatextual operators” (pp. 289–296), “On some metatextual operators containing the component ‘mond’ (s/he says)” (pp. 297–303), “On the structure and functions of text initial metainformational sentences” (pp. 304–310), “On metatextual operators ‘aha’, ‘igen’, ‘mi’ (I see!, yes, what) and that of the expressive ones marking the end of a reply” (pp. 311–314), “Metainformational verbs describing the patterns of receiving information, the effects it makes on the receiver, and the state of memory of the information receiving device” (pp. 315–318), “Metainformational verbs describing the value of information in Hungarian” (pp. 319–320), “The role of metainformation structures in meaning-modification” (pp. 321–324), “Metainformational verbs describing information processing in Hungarian” (pp. 325–328), “Review as a source of metainformation” (pp. 329–333), “Metainformational verbs describing the physical condition of the information source” (pp. 334–335), “Metainformational verbs describing the state of the information receiving device” (p. 336), and “Some notes on the concept and scope of information” (pp. 337–349). With its 64 pages, this chapter is the shortest in the book, but this does not mean that it is less valuable. This chapter is an important contribution to the discussion of the role of metainformational operators, as it reassesses the state of research, its results and directions.

The author uses a number of illustrative, real-life examples to support his thesis. Future research should move in

the direction of a better understanding of the interaction between speakers and their linguistic usage. This could be possibly due to recent developments in textlinguistics and can be achieved, among other things, by a close observation of speaking behaviour.

Despite the fact that our treatment of the papers contained in volume 86 of the Language Study series has been selective, we would like to express our high opinion of the whole book. It is extremely interesting, highly representative of what has been going on in the field of the cognitive linguistic paradigm for the last few decades and as such is highly recommendable not only to those working in the field, but also to all the people who can read Hungarian and take an interest in language without being academically engaged in linguistics *per se*.

Péter Pátrovics

*Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem
eva.egri@uniqa.hu*

RÓBERT KISS SZEMÁN:
“...GARÁZDA EMBEREK AZ
ETYMOLOGUSOK”. IRODALMI
TANULMÁNYOK. Budapest: ELTE
BTK, Szláv Filológiai Tanszék,
2008, 171 pp.

The book “...garázda emberek az *Etymologusok*”. *Irodalmi tanulmányok* (“...*Etymologists Are Riotous People*”. *Literary Studies*), by Róbert Kiss Szemán, Hungarian literary scholar, essayist and translator of Czech and Slovak literature into Hungarian (see, for example his translation of Bohu-